APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/661,589	09/14/2000	Blake Earl Hayward	P3953	9165

24739   7590   02/19/2008
CENTRAL COAST PATENT AGENCY, INC
3 HANGAR WAY SUITE D
WATSONVILLE, CA 95076

EXAMINER
BRUCKART, BENJAMIN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/19/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *31 December 2007*.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *29, 31-34 and 36-38* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *29, 31-34, 36-38* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

Claims 29, 31-34, 36-38 are pending in this Office Action.

Claim 29 is amended.

Claims 1-28, 30, 35 remain cancelled.

\

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed in the amendment filed 12/31/07 have been fully considered

but are found not persuasive. See remarks below.

<u>Applicant's invention as claimed</u>:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claim 29, 30-34, 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by
U.S. Patent No. 6,496,855 by Hunt et al.**

Regarding claim 29, the Hunt reference teaches

a system for fraud prevention by authenticating a user at a first Internet site (Hunt: col. 2,

lines 47-51 shows a user is verified; col. 4, lines 11-22, 30-41 teach protecting data for

preventing fraud), comprising:

an Internet-connected verification server for performing the authentication (Hunt: col. 2, lines 36-51; the server); and

an Internet-connected appliance operable by the user for sending a request for authentication to the first Internet site (Hunt: col. 1, lines 56-61; the user; col. 5, lines 1-10; RAS);

wherein the user specifies sites not associated with the first Internet site known to the user as capable of accepting the user's username-password pair included in the request for authentication and a username-password pair for the user (Hunt: col. 2, lines 47-60; col. 6, lines 48-52; Fig. 1), and the server, in response to the request causes automatic navigation to sites and attempts a login on behalf of the user with the username-password pair, successful login at the sites allowing authentication of the user at the first Internet site (Hunt: col. 4, lines 1-5, 23-26).

The Hunt reference does not explicitly state a second and third Internet sites.

However, the Hunt reference does address the plurality of Internet sites that a user registers and authenticates with as a problem in which the invention is overcoming (Hunt: col. 1, lines 21-23, 30-35) in order to protect user data and privacy with the growth number of sites a user registers with (Hunt: col. 1, lines 21-54).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of fraud preventing by Hunt to include a second and third site that a client wishes to login as taught in the background of Hunt in order to protect user data and privacy with the growth number of sites a user registers with (Hunt: col. 1, lines 21-54).

Regarding claim 31, the system of claim 29, wherein the verification server is a first server, and the request is sent from the appliance to a second server on the network, which forwards at least a portion of the request to the first server, and the first server returns an indication of verification after causing the navigation and log-in attempt to the second and third sites provided by the user (Hunt: col. 2, lines 36-60; first server is target web server; second server is registration agent server; col. 8, lines 39-42).

Regarding claim 32, the system of claim 29, wherein all or a portion of the request is compared against stored user profile data for verification purposes (Hunt: col.3, lines 31-40; col. 2, lines 47-51).

Regarding claim 33, the system of claim 29, wherein the request comprises at least three or more user specified network destination sites and username-password pairs for the sites, and authentication is a number based on log-in results (Hunt: col. 6, lines 48-52; col. 8, lines 43- col. 9, line 15; Fig. 1).

Regarding claim 34, the Hunt reference teaches

a method for fraud prevention by authenticating a user at a first Internet site (Hunt: col. 2, lines 47-51 shows a user is verified; col. 4, lines 11-22, 30-41 teach protecting data for preventing fraud), comprising the steps of:

(a) accepting by a server an authentication request from the user comprising at least a plurality of Internet sites known to the user as capable of accepting the user's username-pair for each site and the username-password pairs are included in the authentication request from the user (Hunt: col. 2, lines 47-60; col. 6, lines 48-52);

(b) causing, by the server, automatic navigation to the sites and an automatic login attempt on behalf of the user with the username-password pairs (Hunt: col. 4, lines 1-5, 23-26); and

(c) reporting an indication of authenticity of the user according to success or failure of the login attempts (Hunt: col. 8, lines 39-42).

The Hunt reference does not explicitly state a second and third Internet site.

However, the Hunt reference does address the plurality of Internet sites that a user registers and authenticates with as a problem in which the invention is overcoming (Hunt: col. 1, lines 21-23, 30-35) in order to protect user data and privacy with the growth number of sites a user registers with (Hunt: col. 1, lines 21-54).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of fraud preventing by Hunt to include a second and third site that a client wishes to login as taught in the background of Hunt in order to protect user data and privacy with the growth number of sites a user registers with (Hunt: col. 1, lines 21-54).

Regarding claim 36, the method of claim 34 wherein the server is a first server, and the request is sent from the appliance to a second server on the network, which forwards at least a portion of the request to the first server, and the first server returns and indication of authenticity after causing the navigation and log-in attempt at the sites provided by the user (Hunt: col. 2, lines 36-60; first server is target web server; second server is registration agent server; col. 8, lines 39-42).

Regarding claim 37, the method of claim 34 wherein all or a portion of the request is compared against stored user profile data for verification purposes (Hunt: col.3, lines 31-40; col. 2, lines 47-51).

Regarding claim 38, the method of claim 34, wherein the request comprises three or more sites and username-password pairs for the Internet sites, and authentication is a number based on log-in results (Hunt: col. 6, lines 48-52; col. 8, lines 43- col. 9, line 15).

Remarks

Applicant has presented a minor amendment to independent claim 29 and presented arguments directed to the Hunt reference. Applicant broadly argues that which the Hunt reference is concerned with, not how the instant claims distinguish from the reference.

The Applicant Argues:

The Hunt reference does not teach the limitations of the claimed invention.

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

The examiner maintains the rejection because the Hunt reference does teach the claimed limitations.

Preamble. With respect to the preamble, Applicant argues the Hunt reference fails to teach a fraud prevention system as claimed.

Hunt teaches 'a system for fraud prevention by authenticating a user at a first Internet site' in col. 2, lines 47-51 and col. 4, lines 11-22, 30-41. Hunt teaches preventing fraud by utilizing a third party proxy login system for registration and repeated login to sites. The first site is the website in which the "registration agent site provides ... to complete registration forms for websites by proxy and logging into their sites on repeat visits." Fraud is interpreted to be "intentional deception." Hunt clearly teaches a fraud prevention system by the proxy controlling access to the email address and protecting the users email address from being used as spam.

First limitation. With respect to the first limitation, Applicant argues Hunt does not teach "an Internet-connected verification server for performing the authentication."

The Hunt reference does teach the limitation, specifically in col. 2, lines 36-40 where Hunt teaches each service computer or server node is internet connected. The Hunt reference teaches the registration agent computer or registration agent server also is connected to the internet. Lines 46-51 of Hunt teach verifying a user identity and password. Fig. 5 confirms this notion with the requirement of login before the RAS can transfer site login details.

Second limitation. With respect to the second limitation, Applicant argues Hunt does not teach "an Internet-connected appliance operable by the user for sending a request for authentication to the first Internet site."

The Hunt reference does teach the limitation specifically in col. 1, lines 56-61 and col. 6, lines 1-10. Col. 1 is relied upon to show a user who is interactive and involved with the fraud prevention system. The user fills in private and personal data as indicated in col. 6. The RAS system is an internet-connected appliance operated on by the user for repeatedly logging into other sites. See Fig 5 for the flow of events in which a user logs into the RAS before sending requests to authenticate to other websites.

Third Limitation and Motivation. With respect to the third limitation, Applicant argues
the Hunt reference does not teach "wherein the user specifies a second and third Internet site not
associated with the first Internet site and known to the user as capable of accepting the user's
username-password pair included in the request for authentication and a username-password pair
for the user, and the server, in response to the request, causes automatic navigation to the second
and third site sites and attempts a login on behalf of the user with the username-password pair,
successful login at the second and third sites allowing authentication of the user at the first
Internet site."

The Hunt reference makes the claim limitation unpatentable. Hunt teaches a user
specifying sites not associated with the first Internet site in col. 2, lines 47-60 and col. 6, lines
48-52 because the Hunt reference shows a user logs into a first site, the RAS system, and then
registers or logs into other sites specified by the user through data structures and forms as
initiated/entered by the user in col. 6. The other websites are known to the user as capable of
accepting requests for authentication because the user's id-password pair associated with other
sites has already been registered with the corresponding web service or site.

The server which is interpreted to be 'an internet-connected verification server' in
response to the request, which is interpreted to be the request for authentication, causes
automatic navigation to sites and attempts a login on behalf of the user with the id-password pair
is taught by Hunt is the one of the most rudimentary features of the invention. Hunt teaches col.
4, lines 1-5, 23-26 the RAS server "logging into sites on repeat visits" so the user doesn't have to
retype all the information. The act of logging in by proxy is the "caused navigation" to the other
sites for attempted login.

The examiner has admitted Hunt does not teach all the claim limitations in a 102
interpretation but that the broad claim limitations are unpatentable as an obvious variation of
Hunt.

The Hunt reference does not explicitly state a second and third Internet sites.

However, the Hunt reference does address the plurality of Internet sites that a user
registers and authenticates with as a problem in which the invention is overcoming (Hunt: col. 1,

lines 21-23, 30-35 and Fig. 1) in order to protect user data and privacy with the growth number of sites a user registers with (Hunt: col. 1, lines 21-54).

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the system of fraud preventing by Hunt to include a second and third site that a client wishes to login as taught in the background of Hunt in order to protect user data and privacy with the growth number of sites a user registers with (Hunt: col. 1, lines 21-54). The motivation to extend the proxy login to additional sites is given both in classification and idea of the prior art (proxy authentication and proxy login by third party systems for fraud prevention) as well as non-explicit embodiments where other web services and web sites are shown (Fig. 1, background).

Regarding claim 34, applicant provides similar arguments to those outlined above. The examiner maintains the rejections on all claims, specifically claims 34 for the same reasons as cited above.

The examiner feels that applicant continues to write broad claim limitations and does not want to further detail the claims.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Benjamin R. Bruckart whose telephone number is (571) 272-

3982. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:30PM with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Benjamin R Bruckart
Examiner
Art Unit 2155

/SALEH NAJJAR/
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER